DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 767 SP 006 917

AUTHOR	McCampbell, James F.; Schwartz, Henrietta
TITLE	A Management Approach to Research in Experimental Programs.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill. Ford Training and Placement Program.
PUB DATE	28 Dec 72
NOTE	45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Management Development; Management Education; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Education; *Teachers

ABSTRACT

Presented is an analysis of the Ford Training and Placement Program from a managerial research point of view. It attempts four things: a) it explains the context that motivated its being written; b) it explains briefly its managerial stance; c) it applies that stance to selected training groups within the program; and d) it draws some conclusions about the weaknesses and strengths of its approach to formulating and answering significant research questions. (JB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 081767

A MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO RESEARCH IN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

by

James F. McCampbell
University of Chicago

Henrietta Schwartz
University of Chicago

December 28, 1972

For presentation at the
American Educational Research
Association Meeting,
February, 1973

SP 006 917

THE CONTEXT

How does one go about evaluating an experimental urban education program? What questions does one ask? Where does one look for answers? An easy answer to these questions--and the one which fairly adequately describes the more typical approaches of educational research--is that statements of goals must be converted into behavioral objectives, to be treated as dependent variables; training procedures must be analyzed into independent variables; and the independent variables must be manipulated so that their effects on the dependent variable can be measured and explained in terms of cause and effect relationships. As we all know, that answer is not actually so easy. There are many problems inherent in creating a research paradigm that is clean enough to sort out and identify the effects of a set of independent variables. But having done so, problems remain.

Such a paradigm is a reduction, and as such omits much. Although independent variables can be measured in terms of their effects on a selected dependent variable, that measurement will not deal with the variety of effects which independent variables may have on other dependent factors which are not part of the research paradigm. For example, the effects of a given pattern of instruction in mathematics on the mathematics test scores of the subjects will not explain whether or not students have been "turned on" to mathematics, or whether or not they like their teachers. Obviously, the typical educational research approach omits much of the complexity of existential life. How can these limitations be overcome? The evaluation procedures used in the Ford Training and Placement Program[1] illustrate one attempt to overcome the limitations of this typical problem in research design. Researchers know, of course, of the variety of changes that are effected in any experimental design before the final formal experiment is conducted. The directions must be changed because the subject does not understand them. The manipulatives

are too large or too small or too difficult to manufacture, etc. Plowing through the muddiness attendant to the development of a clean experiment is something that we all know as a reality existing prior to and unreported in the final paper which documents the experiment. But if a experimental program is aimed at dealing with these existential difficulties, then does it not have a responsibility to report them? Isn't description and analysis of the establishment and development of the program as important as the report of the final results? Aren't unanticipated outcomes as important as those effecting the "dependent variables"?

The questions are, of course, rhetorical. The Ford Training and Placement Program has attempted to describe and analyze the gray areas in the development, implementation, and evaluation of its five years by employing research methods which go beyond the usual educational research model. The attempt was conscious and began early in the program's history.

The "Raw Chronology of the Ford Training and Placement Program"[2] is a bit telegraphic in style, but illustrates the earliest deliberate attempts to expand the research framework. It does not say who made the suggestion, but it states that on April 29, 1968, "Suggested an historian be employed to write a running narrative account of the development of the entire program." Here is early evidence of the conscious decision to document and report the developmental nature of this experimental program, and to go beyond the typical educational research design by incorporating the historical method of research.

At about the same time, the chief administrators of the program began to operationalize and to effect its nature by their decisions as to the details of its implementation. This process was at first only the usual administrative evaluation and action, and it has, of course, continued throughout the life of the program. But we have also attempted to make the managerial decision-making process an articulate method of identifying variables

and testing their significance. The body of this paper develops this managerial method of research.

The formal research and evaluation component of the program was conceived to be responsive to the developmental nature of the program. It has been responsible not only for summative evaluation, but also for formative evaluation which is fed back to the program staff so that it can be used as a basis for constant evolution toward an ideal training and placement program. To do so, the research and evaluation staff has found it necessary to study the nature of the developing cadre groups which are the basic operating mechanism of the program.[3] Consequently, we have available case studies of the development of many of the cadres which the program has trained, and this case study method is a third approach to research.

Finally, the summative evaluation of the program has employed the structured quasi-experimental methodology involving hypothesis testing, repeated measures over time, formal instruments and observations, and quantitative data analysis.[4] This traditional psychometric method is the fourth approach used in the program.

We do not have the kind of data that would be provided by extremely divergent methods of study -- say, the professional writer's short story, the novelist's case study, the photographer's interpretation, or the professional director's movie. Perhaps we should have these because they would aid in giving a sense of the flavor of the program that our more pedantic approaches may miss. But out of all the possibilities, we have at least broadened our approach to research by including four methodologies.[5] The historical, the managerial, the case study, and the psychometric methods have been basic ingredients in the program's conscious attempt to go beyond the typical research paradigm in order to capture more adequately the existential flavor of

the program, its developmental nature, and the full range of its outcomes.

Within the context of this attempt to broaden the perspective that research can give to viewing the Ford Training and Placement Program, this paper articulates, exemplifies, and evaluates the managerial method of research that has been used in the program.

BASIS FOR ANALYSIS

The managerial method that we have used to study the program is a consequence of the style of management that we have used to administer the program. So in order to explain the method of study, we must also describe the management style from which it grows.

In their study of educational administration as a social process, Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell[6] explain that social systems involve both institutions and people, and that social behavior is a function of both the need-dispositions of the individual and the role expectations of the institution. To accomplish its goals, an institution may emphasize its role expectations; an assembly line would be an example. It may emphasize the individual's need-dispositions; a research laboratory would be an example. Or the institution may emphasize the interaction between the role expectations of the institution and the need-dispositions of the people. This last emphasis is called transactional, and it is the emphasis that we have chosen in managing the Ford Training and Placement Program.[7]

There are several reasons why we have chosen the transactional style of management. First, the program is a relatively low power organization which requires the voluntary cooperation of the University, the Board of Education, schools, school communities, and high status people within these groups. Clearly, we could not prescribe our role expectations for these people and groups independently; nor could we succeed if each of them related to the program only on the basis of his own dispositions. We were,

in this sense, forced into a transactional style of management. Second, we see the transactional style as a valued method in itself. If education is to be humane (indeed, if it is to be effective), it must adapt to the needs and desires of the people who make up its institutions. It must be humanizing not only for students, but also for the community and the professional staff. Third, the program goal of decreasing the isolation of educators and improving their functioning as a team is a direct charge to increase the interaction among roles and improve the relationship between rpofessional roles and individual's talents. To fulfill this charge, the transactional style of management was an obvious choice.

The fourth reason for adopting a transactional style has the most direct bearing on our development of an articulate managerial method of research. The Ford Training and Placement Program is both new and experimental. Because we know that in new programs the original design of the program will need change in the process of developing toward the ideal, we want to know what is going wrong so that we can correct. In other words, a major task of administration in a new and experimental program is to make the program self-correcting. If we emphasized individual need-dispositions to the exclusion of the institutional dimension we would have done a disservice to our goals. On the other hand, exclusive emphasis on the role expectations might have the effect of decreasing feedback and masking problems in the program's operation. If people are judged only by their effectiveness in accomplishing the task assigned them, they may have a tendency to hide their failures. If people are simply told what to do, they may resist by simply reporting that they have done so when in fact they have not. Hence, in order to get feedback about flaws in the program's operation we have chosen to emphasize the transaction between the individual's needs and the program's expectations for his role.

To accomplish this transactional style of management, we adopted the strategies that would help us maintain this style. They include 1) parity in structure, 2) roles defined at the interfaces of divergent groups, and 3) negotiation as a decision-making process. All these strategies bring issues to the surface so they can be resolved. If two groups of divergent interests are given parity in the program's structure, then it is likely that the conflicts between the two groups will be emphasized, not diminished. Because they are equally balanced, neither group will be able to dominate the other. Because they are equally balanced, neither group will be easily intimidated. Their parity, thus, raises the conflict between the groups and makes it overt rather than covert or latent. Negotiation as a decision-making method also has the effect of making conflict overt. Voting or parliamentary procedure is an example of a decision-making method which operates effectively without necessarily resolving conflict. In contrast, negotiation is not a speedy way to make decisions. Instead, it is a difficult extended process. But it does help resolve conflict and solve problems. Finally, placing individuals in roles at the interface between groups results in conflict and problems being personified in an individual and communicated by him. At the interface between groups, he is responsible to and for both groups (not to a dominant group for a subordinate group), and as a consequence he brings conflict into the open rather than minimizing it. Issues are communicated as the personal concern of the individual rather than as abstractions. The operation of all three of these strategies, then, has the consequence of bringing conflict into the open, and allowing the program to be self-correcting.

Now this transactional style of management is the basis form which the research exemplified in this paper has grown. An important function of the transactional style of management, in terms of research, is its power in

identifying problems. It brings conflict into the open.

Although conflict is not the same as problem, conflict often leads to problem identification. Frequently, the first evidence of a problem is frustration. Something is going wrong, although we do not know exactly what. People are uncomfortable about what is happening, though they do not know exactly why. There is a sense of wheel spinning rather than progress. Now if the strategies of our transactional style are effective, the frustration becomes focused in a conflict. That is, the frustration is identified and articulated in the disagreement between two (or more) positions. As the disagreement is articulated, the involved parties identify just what it is that they are disagreeing about; opposing points of view about an issue are identified. If we then ask why this is an issue, we are in the process of identifying the causes of disagreement. And if we can identify the causes of an issue, we have identified a problem. That is, "the reason we have this conflict" is the same as "the problem that causes this conflict." The transactional style of management encourages the progression from unfocused frustration to focused conflict, from conflict to identification of a specific issue, from issue to a precise statement of the probleem.

The process of negotiating a resolution to conflict is, then, from this point of view, the process of solving a problem. As the negotiating parties suggest altering conditions, they are implicitly suggesting hypotheses about the variables which are the causes of the conflict. As they agree to changes in conditions they are implicitly testing hypotheses about the variables which cause the problem. If the conflict dissolves when conditions are changed, their implicit hypotheses are supported; if not, they are refuted.

Thus, the transactional style of management incorporates processes similar to major steps in research. Conflict identifes problems; negotiation gathers data and formulates hypotheses; changing conditions tests hypotheses.

While all these steps may take place transactionally they have not always done so in the program. The training cycle of the program is relatively short -- it is concentrated primarily in the one year during which pre-service interns teach part time in the school and the cadre members are supported financially for meeting once a week as a group. Often that one year period has been too short to accomplish more than the clear definition of the issues that are causing major conflict. Consequently, the steps of hypotheses formulation and hypotheses testing have not been carried out completely with the cadre that raised the issue. Instead, the program staff has completed the steps of hypotheses formulation only after the cadre has been trained, and the staff has then tested these hypotheses with new cadres that are just beginning their training.

The body of this paper illustrates the use of this managerial method of research. In each illustration you will see how conflict has been used to identify a problem, how hypotheses have been developed identifying the conditions which cause the problem, how conditions have been altered to test the hypotheses, and how the results of changed conditions have been measured to support or refute the hypotheses. The examples have been ordered in terms of the kinds of changes in conditions that were made. In some cases we changed the design of the program, in some the structures that operationalize the design, in some the people within the structures, and in some we attempted to change the perceptions of the people. We have chosen this method of organization for three reasons. First, the four kinds of changes seem to be a good heuristic for thinking about responses to problems in a program. Second,

they seem intuitively to be more the province of the administrator than anyone else, and thereby emphasize the managerial nature of this approach. Third, they are an easy handle for following a rather long paper.

But the important point that is being made is not that there are four kinds of changes that the administrator can make in response to conflict. It is rather, that the process of management, when articulated, can become a valuable method of formulating and answering significant research questions.

Analysis of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Cadre

The first King high school cadre (1969-1971) operated in an old elementary school building and was called Forrestville High School, serving an area that ranked fifth among the ten poorest communities in Chicago. Ironically, the area is known as Grand Boulevard. In 1970 the median family income of the community was $4,050 per year, with twenty-seven percent of this number earning less than $3,000 per year. Ninety-eight percent of the 26,304 residents were Black; thirty-eight percent of this number were on public assistance. Twelve percent of the adult labor force was unemployed and thirty-four percent of the families in the community lived in public housing, with an average of 3.2 persons per family. The Black student population numbered about 1,600. The faculty of approximately 80 was seventy-five percent Black. The building was designed to serve as an upper grade center and was converted to a senior high school in 1965. The facilities were obviously inadequate; truancy and vandalism were high as was faculty turnover. The Chicago Board of Education planned a new high school to open in May, 1971.

Martin Luther King, Jr. High School, the new school, is about six blocks from the old Forrestville. King opened in September, 1971 to serve the same community which changed little since the above data were compiled. The fall, 1972 enrollment of the modern King High School is about 2,000 Black students, with a faculty of 102, 60% of whom are Black. Fine and performing arts and

athletic activities are emphasized as motivating techniques in the curriculum. The new school features excellent physical facilities, high parental involvement, good attendance averages, little or no vandalism by students inside the school, and high morale among students and faculty. To better know the students and to better understand the problems of the classroom teacher, each administrator,

The first King cadre faced all of the problems suggested by antiquated facilities and a transient student body and faculty; the second King cadre had to deal with all the crises attendant to opening a new school. The Ford Program had to be responsive to both situations in its relationships with the two groups.

Program Design Change

> WORKING DEFINITION:
> Program Design Change involves changes in the operational model as a consequence of the impact of external and internal events and forces. External forces might include loss of fiscal or human resources, movement from a shortage of teachers to a teacher surplus, reduction in levels of school/community co-operation, etc. Internal forces necessitating changes in program design might include staff instability, staff performance, institutional constraints, appropriate sequencing of program goals, etc.

The second Martin Luther King, Jr. High School was created in the Spring of 1971. It was unique in three ways:

1) It was the first cadre to function in a new physical plant. The staff and students were moved from Forrestville High School in Chicago, an old inadequate school building six blocks from the site of the new school.

2) It was the first instance in which a second cadre was placed in a school. The Ford Training and Placement Program had placed an internship cadre at Forrestville High School in 1969-70. The program was pyramiding[8] or recycling the new King cadre on top of the old Forrestville cadre. The old Forrestville cadre (hereafter called the

first King Cadre) was in its second placement year when the second King cadre was formed.

3) The second King cadre was the first all-experienced teacher group. There were no pre-service teaching interns in the group;[9] rather, all seven interns were King High School teachers who worked part-time at the school each day and spent the rest of the time pursuing their Masters' degrees at the University of Chicago. They were experienced teacher interns.

The first unique characteristic was accomplished by default rather than by design. The second King cadre was constructed before the new building was. But the two other features mentioned above represent deliberate program design changes in the operational model of the Ford Training and Placement Program to solve two problems common to all cadres.

The decision to pyramid or recycle is an example of a program design change in response to a set of internal forces. It was made by the staff in response to a reoccuring issue, the problem of elitism. Reports from field staff, cadre liaisons, research and evaluation staff, and minutes of staff meetings are filled with statements about non-cadre faculty members' perceptions of a cadre as being a special or privileged group. Entry problems for the cadre interns were exacerbated by this unfavorable response of the non-cadre faculty. Experienced teachers in the cadres were put in the uncomfortable position of having to take sides or constantly defend the cadre's programs. Much time and effort which could have been spent on more productive projects was devoted to reducing faculty members' anxieties about the cadre. Two cadre members reported at the end of the internship year of the first King cadre:

> In September (1969) we (the cadre) were a threatening coalition from the University of Chicago which (as one non-cadre faculty member said) "was going to take over the

> operation of Forrestville and staff the school with its teacher trainees." But by June, 1970, due to the individual interaction, many members of the faculty had expressed interest in joining the Ford cadre program.[10]

The report goes on to say that three non-cadre faculty members had submitted applications to join, not exactly an overwhelming response. The conclusion of the reported admitted that elitism was still a problem as the cadre approached its placement year, but that strategies had been devised and tested to solve the problem. During the cadre's placement year, 1970-71, the suspicion diminished as cadre interns became full time, valued, and energetic members of the staff, and as the Ford staff continued to support cadre projects which involved non-cadre faculty.

When the time came for the program to form new cadres for the 1971-72 year, the Ford staff faced the problem of elitism by experimenting with a program design change. It was determined that since every cadre that is introduced to a school must face this problem, staff could avoid it by placing a second cadre in a school that already had a cadre. The assumption was that non-cadre staff members at that school would be accustomed to the idea and would not create the conflicts between the cadre and the rest of the staff that normally go with a new cadre. In March of 1971 M. L. King, Jr. High School was selected as the site for a second cadre; the decision was approved by the Ford Executive Committee, and in April, 1971 staff began the selection process for the members of the new King cadre.

The experiences of the pre-service cadres made the Ford staff, particularly the field staff working daily with the groups, aware of the entry problems faced by any new group introduced to the social system of a school/community. The field staff members made it clear that more staff attention would have to be given to working with administrators, school faculty and the community before the cadre entered the school. Time would have to be

devoted to entry problems during the cadres' summer training program, so that each cadre member was aware of the possible conflicts and some probable conflict reduction strategies before entering the school as a participant in a special program affiliated with a prestigious university. The university faculty had to be informed about these problems and persuaded to make their expertise available not only to the cadre but also to the non-cadre school staff once the school year began. Further, the staff and the cadre had to spend much more time presenting the program, explaining its aims and constraints to the school/community so that parents and teachers had realistic expectations of what the cadre and the program could do.

The problem of elitism exists for any new cadre entering a school. But before the second King cadre was formed, the program staff did work intensively over a period of five months with the administration, the faculty, and the community of King High School. The 1971 summer training program incorporated as one major element, the identification and negotiation of entry problems. Each cadre attempted to frame the kinds of questions and situations which would have to concern the group in its relations with the larger faculty and community. Although the second King cadre was an all-experienced teacher group drawn from the King faculty, the cadre members worked on this problem extensively during the summer and monitored the non-cadre faculty perceptions concerning the cadre during the school year.

We chose to respond to the problem of elitism by placing a second cadre of all-experienced teachers in a school which had a positive experience with a previous cadre. We might have decided to try an alternative solution which would not have required a program design change, but rather a re-allocation of staff resources. That is, we could have assigned staff members to engage in a year's work with a given school/community preparing them

for a preservice cadre. Indeed, after the first year of the program, once a school was selected as a site for a cadre, staff members did devote more time and effort to preparing a school for the cadre. But as an experimental and developmental program, we had an obligation to create, test, and evaluate new operational procedures for solving training and placement problems within the conceptual framework and goals of the program. The pyramiding of cadres was a new way for the Ford Program.

The FTPP model was changed in response to the problem of elitism; a second cadre was created from a high school staff which had almost two years of experience with a cadre. The results indicate that this program design change did respond productively to the problem. The second King cadre has been one of the most effective in the program's five-year history.[11] Several research reports[12] document this effectiveness and three of the reports[13] attribute the high level of task accomplishment in the groups to the good relationship the second King cadre established immediately with the rest of the faculty. In his "Comparative Observations of Two Cadres" Richard Smith, an intern with the Forrestville cadre and now a member of the second King cadre, provides an excellent summary of the results of this change in program design.

> "Therefore, as viewed by the rest of the faculty, we (the first King cadre at Forrestville, 1969-70) were an elitist group who had an "in" with the principal and received everything that it wanted. . .The present King cadre "is" the faculty. Every member is at the school every day (excluding the role specialists and community person). The only persons in the present cadre new to the faculty are the role specialists. . .therefore, the problem of isolation is non-existent. The cadre is made up of at least one member of every major sub-group in the school. There is a mixture of experiences ranging from teachers with two years of teaching experience to teachers with over fifteen years of experience. The problems of isolation, lack of communication with the greater faculty, and the threat of having to deal with new ideas and teaching methods has been eliminated.[14]

It should be mentioned that documentary evidence was presented to support the statement that many non-cadre faculty attended the open second King cadre meetings and supported cadre activities. The official membership of the group expanded from 25 to 45 during the year.

The second King cadre also offers an example of a change in program design in response to external events because it was an all-experienced teacher cadre. The program design was formulated in 1967 in the midst of a teachers' shortage in inner-city schools and high attrition and turnover rates among young new teachers. By 1969 this condition was reversed and the program's progress report of 1969-70 designates the placement of interns in the schools where they trained as a major problem to be faced in the coming year.[15] By 1970-71 the problem mandated some drastic change in the program's design for training. It was impossible to find a secondary school in the Chicago system which could place on a full-time basis 6 to 8 new teachers, particularly in the areas of English and history - nor could any elementary school incorporate 6 to 8 new faculty members. The program each year had placed experienced teacher interns in one or two of the cadres. In reviewing the stability and performance of these experienced teacher interns, staff discovered that experienced teacher interns pursued their academic work with dispatch and earned their degrees in the allotted time, took what they learned at the University back to the classroom, tended to stay at the school, frequently assumed leadership roles in the school and cadre and tended to respond more positively to the summer program training experiences than pre-service persons.[16]

It was decided to form an all-experienced teacher cadre in March, 1971. The staff worked out the criteria and design for this new kind of cadre at an all-day staff meeting,[17] and had the design change approved by the Executive Committee. The second King cadre was formed in the spring, trained in the summer of 1971, and began its first school year in the fall of 1971.

The program design was changed in response to the external movement from a shortage of teachers in the Chicago Public School system to a surplus of teachers in the system. Since this condition created placement difficulties, the model was changed from training pre-service interns to retraining experienced teachers. This meant we had to make attendant changes in our selection model, staff placements, training program, and research and evaluation techniques. The staff, after careful deliberation, instituted these changes and the results were most rewarding. Contrary to the other two cadres that year with pre-service interns, the King cadre had no placement problems.[18] The other two cadres were not able to place any of the pre-service interns and much staff time and energy was consumed trying to find other placements, to say nothing of the anxiety level created for the interns concerning job security. Most interns could not be placed as a group; therefore, placement programs at the internship schools could not be planned and/or funded. By contrast, the second King experienced teacher cadre was able to prepare a school-wide reading proposal, implement a summer program to prepare for the reading program, continue to work on projects instituted in the internship year, and replicate successful programs tried in the internship year.

Structural Change

> WORKING DEFINITION:
> Structural changes are those which revise the patterns of organizational elements in the program. Examples of structural change would include the formation or dissolution of committee structures; the incorporation of new staff roles into the structure; new relationships, eventually legitimated, between staff and program participants to accomplish goals; reallocating responsibility for task accomplishment, etc.

Two major conflicts that became particularly apparent with the first King cadre concerned the issues of autonomy and research. These conflicts resulted in major changes in the structures used to implement the program design, and the effectiveness of the changes is apparent in the lack of

conflict in these two issues with the second King cadre.

The issue of autonomy centers around the amount of control the cadre will have over its own destiny, and the amount of direction it should respond to from the program. As this issue developed and was responded to in conflicts between the staff and the first King cadre, much of our conscious thought about a transactional style emerged. When the first King cadre was formed, the program was in the process of changing directors. The old director focused on sensitivity training techniques in the development of the group; the new director focused on individual role competency for interns in the classroom and cadre accomplishment of joint projects using group process techniques and consultants as facilitators.[19]

The cadre began its life during the time when the Ford program treatment focused on promoting positive interpersonal relationships among cadre members through sensitivity training activities which occupied much meeting time. There was no explicit charge that the cadres assume the responsibility for assisting pre-service interns to gain classroom competence, though this was certainly implied. By contrast, the new director explicitly charged the cadres with the need for the groups to attend to the teaching problems of new interns and the retraining of experienced teachers and to use cadre meeting time to address these issues. Thus, a specific direction was expected for cadre energies. The new director assumed that as cadre members worked together on what they agreed were important tasks, and they agreed classroom competence was important, they would develop positive feelings about one another, feelings attendant to the successful completion of given tasks. Cadre members were informed by the new director that they were expected to visit and observe colleagues' classes, spend cadre meeting time introducing newcomers to the administrative procedures of the school, be responsible for managing cadre funds under certain program guidelines, devise and implement

ways to incorporate continuous community inputs, etc. To facilitate, manage, monitor and provide feedback to the program, new staff roles were created -- first, the cadre liaison, who was responsible for assisting the group in moving toward the activities stated above, and second, the group process consultant who was responsible for assisting the group deal with communication and interpersonal problems which arose as the cadre worked on tasks. The first King cadre was created and had its early socialization in a process-oriented program climate which was changed to a task-process program orientation. Both program directors had the same general goals for the program; they used different structural arrangements to accomplish these ends. The change in goal sequence, structure, and program emphasis contributed to the conflict around the issue of cadre autonomy.

Racial tension between the first King cadre which was all Black and the Ford staff which was integrated was probably another contributing factor in the conflict that developed between the two groups. The program design model does not specify what the racial composition of the cadres should be, but when the Ford Program was designed in 1967, integration was still a valued pattern of social organization for most school people, Black and white. By the spring of 1969, the rapid growth of Black separatism was on the campus, in the schools, and affecting the program. So strong had this movement become that several inner-city schools responded negatively to the placement of an integrated cadre, whereas all of these schools seemed to be receptive to such an idea in the spring of 1968. Additionally, the Black students in the MAT program at the University of Chicago petitioned the Ford Program and its Executive Committee for the formation of an all-Black cadre to go to Forrestville High School. In fact, they said that they would not become involved with the program unless they could be members of an all-Black group. The staff persuaded the Executive Committee that this group should be formed,

and the committee agreed. The difficulty surrounding the creation of the all-Black cadre, the ethos assumed by the group, and the anxiety of staff members created friction between the first King cadre members and the Ford program staff.

Possibly another factor contributing to the conflict had to do with the student activism on most university campuses in 1969. The interns, second-year students in the University of Chicago's Master of Arts in Teaching program, were young, bright, energetic, and aggressive. As members of the first King cadre, they raised the issue of autonomy loudly and articulately.

> Hence a major part of the early cadre meetings of the first King cadre, 1969, was devoted to the problem of how to construct a cadre philosophy in light of the demands placed by Ford - that is, how to be autonomous within the school and not in the university? Ford wants cooperation - we want autonomy. At what stage do we settle the two, if ever?[20]

Some few Black staff members had entry to the cadre meetings; but even they had to request permission in advance before attending. The first King cadre tried to reject the staff field liaison and staff group process consultant who had been carefully selected to work with the group and the new director of the program was called upon to negotiate the acceptance of these staff members. The cadre, the director, and the staff spent much time working out the appropriate arrangements to achieve a balance between cadre autonomy and program demands[21] and all staff members who worked with the King cadre were made familiar with the expectations which the cadre had concerning staff (other than liaison and group process consultant) functioning. The three major expectations were:

1. Staff members must request permission through the liaison to attend cadre meetings and to be included on the agenda of the cadre.

2. Staff members must seek cadre inputs at the planning stage for the program activities in which they wish the cadre to participate - dissemination and demonstration activities, national conference participation, research and evaluation activities.

3. If staff collects information about or from cadre members and cadre activities, the report must be presented to cadre before being circulated to program readership.

The relationship which evolved between the first King cadre and the program staff was the result of the cadre's constant testing of the integrity, authenticity, and flexibility of the staff. If staff issued a directive concerning supplies, tuition, funding, audio-visual equipment, attendance, or anything, the other two cadres would read and question; the King cadre would reject and then negotiate. Consequently, program business was transacted with the King cadre first, and eventually with the other cadres, until the transactional style became the modus operandi for the Ford Training and Placement Program staff.

Groping toward the resolution of this conflict was an extremely frustrating task for the staff. But the structural changes which resulted -- the limitations on staff freedom to enter the cadre meetings, the inclusion of cadre members in program planning, and the cadre's authority over dissemination of information -- were effective in decreasing conflict over the issue of autonomy. During their placement year they incorporated two white teachers. The second King cadre was racially integrated from its inception.

Another structural change occurred as the program staff sought to reduce the tension between the cadre and the staff. The structure of the research and evaluation effort was changed in response to the conflict between first King cadre participants and the initial rather traditional research and evaluation plan that staff tried to implement. The first King cadre would not keep weekly individual logs in the summer, would not have a non-participant researcher sitting in each cadre meeting, and would not fill out formal attitudinal instruments. As Blacks they felt particularly keen about the exploitative history of hit-and-run university research teams.[22] Toward the end of the internship year the staff negotiated a series of individual interviews with the cadre[23] and some papers giving responses of individuals in the group.[24]

Since the first King cadre would not participate in the FTPP research and evaluation design, by the time the second King cadre was created, we changed the structure for getting research and evaluation done, partly on the basis of what we had learned and also on the basis of the good ideas about jointly designing research that had come out of the first King cadre. Instead of the typical instruction sheet approach, staff did extensive pre-explanation sessions, sharing with participants the research questions we were interested in and getting their responses and suggestions for other things to consider. We negotiated a design; one which people were willing to support. Instead of formal instruments, we asked for teachers' participation in classroom investigations which were more meaningful to participants, where staff served as resource persons and trained observers. Information was shared. Instead of a design imposed by the program to evaluate cadre projects, we asked the cadre to take the responsibility for evaluation of their own projects. We suspect the new evaluation structure was accepted because the first King cadre was too proud to permit the program to report that "we cannot say anything about the first King cadre," implying they accomplished little if anything. They felt the need for a written record, just as the FTPP did. We reallocated the responsibility for the task of evaluation of cadre projects and functions to the cadre. More often than not the research and evaluation staff was consulted for assistance in designing evaluations, for help in analyzing data, and for aid in preparing final reports. The FTPP staff integrated course work into cadre activities so participants could get course credit for the research and evaluation and writing they did. When the second King cadre was formed there was a respect for the expertise of the research and evaluation staff services, a working level of trust between cadre and staff, and a readiness to participate in the more formal instrumental and quantitative evaluation design. The second King cadre displayed an eagerness to compare results with other groups.[25]

The change in the structure, in the formal and informal relationships, yielded much valuable information about the two King cadres which our original traditional research and evaluation design could not have produced. In February of 1972 the second King cadre prepared a 110-page interim report written by teachers, role specialists, and the liaison, representing every department in the King High School. The report summarized the cadre's accomplishments and plans for the future. In May, 1972 the King cadre prepared a 66-page proposal including a history of the two cadres, a statement of the problems, the status of each department and data needed, proposed plans and budgets from every department in the school to implement reading instruction in each content area. An unplanned consequence was that cadre members did some ethnographic writing which staff thought they might have to do, and the cadre members did it with a first-hand knowledge of the culture of the cadre. The unusual pattern of participant becoming staff planner and of staff planner taking directives from participants was legitimated in the program staff structure with the incorporation of the role of placement year cadre liaison - an individual selected by the cadres to become a staff member with automatic membership on the Program Planning Committee in order to represent the interests, needs, and aspirations of the second, third, and fourth year cadres. Clearly, the conflict management model led to functional change and greater personal satisfaction through structural change.

Personnel Change

WORKING DEFINITION:

> Personnel Change would include changes in the selection models used to choose staff and participants, in the removal of staff and participants who did not meet role expectations, in adding new staff members and cadre participants, in the loss of key staff members, in the change of top program administrators, in revisions of the incentive system used to attract and retain staff and participants, etc.

Some of the information presented at the beginning of this section is not derived directly from the conflict management model used in this paper. However, it is important information, though it falls into that gray area not covered by our model. It is presented here because it relates to personnel selection and the nature of the personnel in the program.

We have some evidence to indicate that one of the reasons for the productivity of the first and second King cadres is the high calibre of intelligent, committed, and sensitive cadre members and staff persons in the two groups. The first King cadre drew five Black MAT interns from the University of Chicago - young persons dedicated to working together in an inner-city school. These young people were energetic, smart, and aggressive enough to make the program and the university accede to their wishes to form a cadre incorporating the Black MATs. The MATs were matched with five open-minded, flexible, and creative experienced teachers from Forrestville High School selected by a perceptive and skilled principal in conjunction with the FTPP staff. The first cadre also included the acting principal[26] and a social psychological specialist intern. The two FTPP staff members were the liaison, who was a former well-respected faculty member of the school with administrative skills and analytical abilities, and a group process consultant, a faculty member from the school of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, a National Training Laboratory fellow with exceptional talent in the area of group development.

At the time the first King cadre was created the program was still formulating a viable selection model. By 1971, when the second King cadre was formed, a functional selection model had been developed and tested.[27] So

while the selection process for appropriate personnel for the first King cadre yielded good results by divination, the selection process for the second King cadre yielded good results by design. (The program has recorded and evaluated the elements of the selection model design).

The two King cadres participated in a number of staff and cadre personnel changes. Some personnel changes were made by the program purposely to reduce conflicts affecting the functioning of the cadre. Others were made as a response to conflicts resulting from the nature and location of the program which implicitly had an impact on the cadre.

The model suggests that conflict can occur when there is dissonance between institutional role expectations and an individual's dispositions or behavior. The two examples cited below describe changes in program personnel to manage this kind of conflict.

The program's expectations for field staff roles developed over time.[28] The cadre liaison person was to attend regular weekly and monthly cadre meetings, spend twenty hours per week in the school or at the University serving as a resource to cadre members and other faculty involved in cadre projects. The liaison was to consult regularly with the principal and the cadre's group process consultant and serve as a communication link between the school, the Ford staff, and the University. In addition to informing the Ford staff of the cadre's progress and problems, the first King cadre liaison was both an interpreter of and an advocate for the cadre, particularly in their requests for extraordinary resources from the Ford Program. By the time the second King cadre began its internship year, the liaison person had acquired the new skills necessary to function as the group process consultant for the group. Therefore, a new staff person was selected to fill the liaison role in accordance with a reasonably well-delineated selection model and set of functional expectations for the role.

The program administrators made periodic evaluations of all staff persons. As a result of observations and of reports from the second King cadre members, the group process consultant and the King High School principal, in the winter of 1972, the director of the FTPP found it necessary to inform the new liaison of the cadre's and the program's dissatisfaction with his role performance. Meetings were held with the group process consultant, the principal, the program director, and the liaison to clarify expectations and establish a time line for improvement in performance. In late March, after staff evaluation of the liaison's performance by the cadre, the group process consultant, the principal, and other concerned staff persons, the program director decided to dismiss the liaison. The group process consultant and the principal informed the cadre and the director informed the liaison. The cadre had been aware of low level of performance by the liaison and made no protest. This is an example of a personnel change percipitated by the cadre and effected by staff to enhance the cadre's functioning.

The nature and location of the program mandated another personnel change in the second King cadre. The FTPP is located in the Department and Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago. The interns in cadres, though working as part-time employees in the Chicago Public Schools, are also University of Chicago students completing degree programs and, therefore, are expected to maintain a given level of academic and practical performance during the internship. The program is by nature and title a <u>training</u> program; hence, the trainee should not be expected to perform at the same level as the fully-licensed professional. The point is that the schools have one set of expectations for the performance of employees and the university has another set of expectations for the performance of a trainee. Ford must mediate the often conflicting sets of expectations for the intern cadre member.[29]

This kind of conflict led to the removal of the adult education intern from the second King cadre in the Spring of 1972. Some of the problem had to do with the inflexibility and non-performance of the role incumbent, but the basic problem was in the definition and implementation of the role of adult educator in a regular day school program.[30] The adult education training program at the University of Chicago had some perceptions about the role[31] which did not fit those of the Chicago Public Schools. The Ford Program was not successful in reducing the dissonance between these institutional perceptions. In its five-year history the program was able to place only one adult educator in a day school program and the functioning of this role does not meet the criteria of the Adult Education program at the University of Chicago.

The second King cadre adult education intern was judged unsatisfactory by the University of Chicago faculty member in charge of the internship. The faculty member requested that the FTPP remove the person from the internship at King and from the cadre. The program managers engaged in a series of meetings with the cadre, the adult educator, and the University of Chicago faculty member. The cadre's membership was split for a variety of reasons - some wanted to remove the intern, others did not wish to remove her. But since the adult educator's past performance or lack of it did not enlist full cadre support for the position, the adult education intern was removed. The cadre was willing to police its own. The program staff had to demonstrate the same commitment to program goals. This is an important, always painful, process which we do not avoid. Sometimes personnel changes occur over which the program has no control - marriage, resignation, pregnancy, a better offer elsewhere, and insoluable conflicts can cause staff members and program participants to leave. The administrators of the program must select, train, and reward staff in such a way as to attract and retain the best personnel.

Perception Change

> WORKING DEFINITION:
> Changes in perception may occur when individuals in the system gain insights which allow them to view conflict as productive rather than destructive, to perceive accommodation of divergent views as negotiation rather than capitulation, to understand that analysis of issues is more fruitful than placing blame on individuals, to recognize that, when working on group tasks, a predictable functional response from an individual need not be accompanied by eternal friendship to be valid and useful.

The development of the first and second King cadre was facilitated by changes in perceptions and attitudes at several levels. Perception change occurred at the staff level when we became aware that conflict between staff and cadre group was a significant and sometimes desirable event.

For example, the staff memos to, and documents by, the first King cadre in the fall and winter of 1969-70 again and again contain references to the conflict between the cadre and the FTPP. Staff meeting minutes detail the conflict reduction strategies instituted by staff. Here are some samples.

> From the group log of the first King cadre, July 18, 1969:
>
> "The commitment of the cadre group is not to the program (FTPP) or even to the University and its courses; rather, the commitment tends to be to the children of Forrestville (first King cadre site): those we work with in microteaching and those with whom we expect to work in the fall. . ."

The staff was disturbed by this attitude toward the program; the staff was not disturbed by the group's expressed commitment to children. But it was upsetting to have the cadre refuse to do individual logs or to respond to other instruments for research and evaluation. Rather, the cadre did group logs and the members would respond only to a personal, individual interview with a staff member they selected to conduct the interviews. It was upsetting to have the group initially reject the staff members so carefully selected to

work with the cadre. Rather than engage in the paper battle of program directives and cadre rejections, we decided to negotiate the conflicts which might result from those cadre requests which gave evidence of their commitment to students. But while other conflict issues could be discussed, some areas were non-negotiable. One such area was staff selection.

Many of the first King cadre meetings in September, 1969 were given to objecting to the selection of the staff group process consultant who would begin work with the group in October. A staff member who had established a working relationship with the group during the summer program was sent to several cadre meetings to discover precisely what the problem was and to deal with the conflict regarding the appointment. We reserved the right to make the appointment and determined it would stand, but we also recognized that the conflict could not be ignored if the group process consultant was to function effectively.

> "The hiring of Mr. X as a consultant without any previous indication that the decision was pending (occupied much time at cadre meetings). Mr. Y's (A FTPP staff member) attendance at the October 2, 1969 cadre meeting combatted some of the suspicions caused by this decision. The cadre emphasized that it was not the decision that caused concern, but the manner in which decision-making on such issues is done."[32]

Staff's perception that the friction was productive developed during the year of conflict management with the first King cadre. It was important that we were able to sort out the difference between conflict that was the result of silliness on the part of the cadre[33] or a mistake on our part, and that conflict which was a natural part of the developing autonomy of the cadre group.

To illustrate, cadre members of the first King cadre looked upon Ford as an unlimited source of funds and were most vocal when FTPP refused to honor some requests for funds.[34] These petty conflicts were settled by directives

and referrals to the program's guidelines governing the dispersal of monies. However, in view of the group's stated commitment to the students, when they requested the use of Rockerfeller Chapel for graduation ceremonies, because of inadequate facilities at the school, the FTPP staff made the complex arrangements and funds necessary to allow the use of the University facility by an off-campus group. Members of the FTPP central office staff, after requesting permission to, did attend many cadre meetings in 1969-70, and had the opportunity to observe the dedication and talent of the group. Minutes of staff meetings during this period reveal that as staff members had direct contacts with the group, usually as a result of the need to deal with conflict, these staff members became advocates for the cadre. They became sensitive to the productive possibilities of conflict management with the group, and less inclined to panic in the face of conflict.

The final points of conflict for the first King cadre related to: 1) their participation in evaluation of the internship year; and 2) the appointment of a placement year cadre liaison. The first issue, participation in research and evaluation, was resolved over a six-month period beginning with the program's administrators negotiating three alternative procedures to obtain the data needed to make judgments about the cadre. (It should be noted that the research and evaluation staff was skeptical about the usefulness of the data given the constraints under which they were collected.)[35]

1) The cadre would devise its own self-evaluation outline which individuals would use to record their perceptions of the cadre. Guidance from the FTPP staff would be available. The cadre group would analyze the individual responses and select members to prepare the final report. Many consultations were held with FTPP staff in the Spring of 1970. The outline was completed in March, 1970 and the report was submitted in July, 1970.[36]

2) The cadre members would participate in individual interviews with a research and evaluation staff member selected by Ford, but whom they approved and who would send the cadre the research report before it was

circulated more broadly. The interview questions dealt with the individual's reasons for being in an inner-city school, responses to the FTPP, and thoughts about research and evaluation. The report was completed and circulated without changes and with the cadre's approval in July, 1970.[37]

3) The cadre would videotape two cadre meetings, assist the FTPP staff in editing the tapes, and participate in the programs' 1970 Spring Conference by preparing curriculum demonstrations of cadre projects in English, art, and mathematics. The video tape was shown to a conference audience, April, 1970 and has been used to assess group development patterns for the cadre.[38] The curriculum materials were displayed and later written up and added to the FTPP research and evaluation materials.[39]

The documents and presentations negotiated between the staff and the first King cadre have been among the most useful in evaluating the program. The results of the conflict reduction set the stage for a rethinking and a revision of the research and evaluation process in the program.[40]

The second issue, the selection of a placement year liaison, was the first King cadre's final attempt to see if FTPP could be intimidated in a decision-making area reserved for staff. A member of the cadre who had demonstrated teaching competence and leadership, worked well with the principal, had the respect of his colleagues, knew the university resources and who could work with FTPP staff was selected upon advice from the cadre liaison, the group process consultant, and the principal to fill the role of placement year liaison. The cadre, in writing, objected to the way in which the decision was made and suggested for the role two other cadre members who would be graduate students at the University during the placement year. The cadre made it clear they did not object to the individual selected, just the way in which the selection was accomplished.

A memo was sent to the group outlining the reasons for the selection and offering to meet to discuss the issue. The cadre accepted the rationale outlined in the memo for staff selection of personnel and indicated they

accepted the choice made by staff and felt it was not necessary to discuss the issue. However, with future cadres we asked each group to elect from their membership a placement year liaison whose appointment would be subject to staff approval.[41]

Staff perceptions changed and wisdom grew as we learned that we were better off living with, and attending to, the headaches of a group that defied us and took a role in its own direction than we would be with a group which passively accepted our leadership only to fall apart when FTPP withdrew in the placement year. The first King cadre did not fall apart; it expanded and strengthened its activities.

Perceptions of cadre members about FTPP changed over the period from 1969 to 1972, the time span covering the first and second King cadres. Comparisons in statements in the year-end reports and other documents about the first and second year cadres demonstrate these changes.

June, 1970 - Cadre Relationship with the Ford Training and Placement Program

> The non-existence of a unified cadre philosophy was also the basis of conflict with the FTPP. It seemed that when the cadre became frustrated with its inability to cohere, FTPP became a convenient organ to attack. This became a way of escaping the problem of cohesiveness pressing the cadre, and provided an outlet for the pent-up frustrations. (It was in this area, a unified attack or defense against an "outside" force, that the cadre was most successful in its early stages. This, more than anything else, produced a sense of unity.) Yet the internal problems of the cadre still remained, and do so presently to a lesser extent.
>
> The above is not to say that FTPP should not be attacked --criticised--fought, and changed, but not in lieu of, or as a psychic release for, overwhelming frustrations. The cadre was ever aware of the fact that in forming an educational philosophy, it might be necessary to attack the philosophy of the organization which was providing the means for its existence. . .

> In all honesty, it must be stated that the lack of communication between the Forrestville cadre and the Ford staff was not wholly the fault of the FTPP staff members. The cadre, being all Black, and having experienced initial difficulty in authorization as an all-Black cadre, was overly suspicious of all staff members and requested that they not be present at cadre meetings except by invitations. All of the cadre members shared the notion that as an all-Black cadre, we had to be allowed to go through the process of working out our own problems without the dictates of a higher authority (this process has traditionally been denied Black folk in educational organizations and elsewhere). When the cadre began to shape its notions of itself and its own destiny, this attitude of hostility underwent a gradual change and by the winter quarter, individual staff members had been invited to several meetings. [42]

Early in the 1970-71 school year, FTPP staff was discussing the possibility of forming the second King cadre on the basis of the productivity of the first group. Discussions were held with the first King cadre and the school administrator. Hard questions were asked about the willingness to participate in research and evaluation given the group's previous stance and the program's need to do some summative and quantitative measurements. In response, the cadre, with the help of a staff member, prepared a statement of intent at the end of January, 1971.

> "We believe that we offer an excellent opportunity for educational research of every description in a Black slum ghetto school. We seek help. All we ask of any research-oriented institution is that they not simply investigate us, but commit some of their resources to making our school a truly productive high school and our students successful and happy people.[43]

The group submitted a full proposal to FTPP for consideration as the demonstration and induction school and for the formation of a second cadre in March, 1971. Again, the issue of collaborative relationships with the University and FTPP was addressed.[44]

Furthermore, our staff is research-oriented. We are not afraid of experimentation and don't find it distasteful. We realize that failure is a necessary step on the road to success. As University High serves as one kind of laboratory school model, we see ourselves as being another type of lab school, one that is closer to the problems confronting teachers in the typical teaching-learning situation. We know that innovation in curriculum, teacher training, school organization, and administration are necessary if the needs of our students and the societal demands placed on them are to be met successfully. Our plans and hopes go beyond a short-term association with Ford Training and Placement Program. We envision a long-term educational relationship with the University of Chicago and its great resources. Together we can come to grips with all the real problems in a truly urban ghetto school. . .

If you, as members of the University community, can help us bridge the tremendous gap between research and practice in urban education, not only will you be of greater service to your students, but together we might make important inroads in the morass of urban miseducation.

The FTPP staff reviewed the proposal, endorsed it, and submitted it to the program's Executive Committee and to the Graduate School of Education for approval. Eight specific judgments regarding criteria for selection of Martin Luther King High School as the site for the second cadre were made in March, 1971.

Two are cited.

6. EXPERIENCE WITH FTPP: The prior cadre has made the school staff familiar with FTPP. The positive nature of that experience gives us a strong basis for future development. (All cadre interns are still members of the school staff.)

7. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: Close interaction of many Forrestville staff members and the University have laid the groundwork for positive future interaction. The "Proposal for a Demonstration School" written by the Forrestville administrative staff is further evidence of the possibility of positive relationships.

When the second King cadre was formed, it was apparent that staff and King faculty members' perceptions had changed to maximize the benefits derived from the reciprocal nature of the relationship. The second King cadre had a most productive internship year in 1971-72, participated fully in the instrumental

and observational evaluation covering time one and time two measurements, and took initiative and leadership roles in general FTPP activities (these are specified in the 1971-72 FTPP progress report). Two of many statements from the second King cadre's file reflect the change in cadre members' perceptions of the FTPP.

> "The initial experiences for the cadre were planned by the FTPP staff with two goals in mind. 1) Cadre members were expected to negotiate relationships with each other which would sustain the groups through the many tasks it would undertake during the year. 2) Ford staff expectations were that this development of group norms begin during the six-week summer training program and continue throughout the year. . .
>
> (The cadre goals, staff expected, would be complimentary to the FTPP goals) Clearly the King cadre internalized these staff goals early. . .Group solidarity did not come easy . . .After six weeks the group had tested each other's commitment and had reached, for the moment, acceptable working relationships. . .Cadre goals did not develop in a vacuum. . . goals mutually acceptable to the group and the program had been formalized three weeks into the summer program.[47]

A letter sent in the name of the second King cadre by the principal to the director and staff of FTPP on June 28, 1972 states in part -

> We're very pleased to report that we enjoyed a most successful and auspicious year at King High School. We are aware of the fact that much of our first year success is a direct result of the support provided us by you, the Ford program and staff.
>
> While the rigors of the school year don't afford us frequently the opportunity to express to you how much we appreciate your tireless efforts on our behalf, let us say now that we of King do most sincerely express our gratitude, fondness, and appreciation for a difficult job done exceedingly well. . .
>
> King is in the process of rapidly becoming a great high school. You can be proud of the role you played in creating this success."

All of the above examples illustrate changes in perception as a result of the interaction between FTPP and the King cadres. The stimulus for changes in the perceptions of staff members came from the King cadre and the stimulus for changes in the perceptions of King cadre members came from the Ford staff.

That is, the stimulus for changes in perceptions was external to the cadre and the staff. Mention should be made of an internal stimulus which led to changes in cadre members' perceptions about each other. We believe these changes were crucial to the high level of output of the groups.

The internal change in the collective perception of the second King cadre we observed was that rather than spending cadre time talking about trust, these experienced teachers realized early on that it was more important (in terms of the short-term goals) to learn to work together as a group. To insure immediate benefit to the King students the group perceived it was more functional for them to work as a group than it was for them to trust each other intimately. Almost all observational and evaluation reports by staff and by cadre refer to the high level of task orientation apparent in the school-based group. The extensive experiences of the cadre members provided the stimulus for this collective task orientation. There were things to be done and the accomplishment of tasks took priority over solutions to interpersonal problems. One could almost hear members saying - "I am not fond of all these people on my task force, but they are competent, they have the necessary expertise, they have made a commitment, and I can trust them to do their job." Interpersonal issues were raised when individuals were incompetent, misrepresented their expertise, and failed to meet their task commitments. For example, the adult education intern led the group to believe she had a set of skills she would use to institute programs in the community. Programs were slow in coming. Finally, the group assigned two specific tasks to the intern which were not completed. It was after this failure to meet task commitments that the cadre raised the interpersonal issues which had been producing angst for the group for some time.

The second King cadre perceived that the purpose of the group process activities and consultants was not to create a perfect world of complete communication and eternal trust. They perceived these activities and the staff role

as mechanisms which would help the group create a way of managing the conflicts and problems of the real work-a-day world. The management of conflict and problems would proceed in such a way as to allow cooperation to exist and flourish in spite of difficulties. The assumption was that trust and friendship would come eventually from good working relationships.

The perception changes in the FTPP staff and in cadres were instrumental to the effective execution of the mutual goals of the two groups. The section of this paper on changes in perception is twice as long as those portions of the paper devoted to changes in program design, structure, and personnel. In a literary sense, this is an unbalanced presentation, but in a logical sense it is an accurate picture of what must be emphasized in any experimental program which seeks to self-correct its operations. Perceptual or attitudinal changes, the way people feel and think about other objects and actors in the program, must preceed and/or accompany the other changes, or the introduction of these other changes may result in role playing exercises with no real involvement on the part of the program staff or the cadre members. Further, perceptual changes must follow the other changes in order for the other changes to achieve some degree of legitimation. We believe changes in perceptions are a tendant to and crucial factors in any other changes made by management to improve the program, or indeed to insure the survival of the experiment's delicate balance of components.

CONCLUSION

How effective is this managerial method as a research tool? That is, how effective is it in formulating and answering significant research questions?

Research from this managerial model has unique characteristics which result in strengths and limitations. Both follow from the fact that it short-circuits the total paradigm of research. The short-circuit results from its development from the problems of management rather than research, and its focus on problems to be solved. In more graphic terms, if a cadre in the program was working perfectly, this management method of research would have nothing to report.

It is possible to compare a more typical research paradigm to the conflict management research model (see diagram below). In the typical paradigm, value

	More typical Research Paradigm	Conflict Management Research Paradigm
Judgment	Minimized	Based on program objectives
Questions	Functional relationships	Systemic cause-effect relationships
Treatment	Test alternatives (hypothesis testing)	Change onflict-producing conditions
Result	Explanation of relationships	A smoothly-operating program

judgments are minimized and the questions are centered on the functional relationships between variables. The approach to the questions is the manipulation of variables to test a variety of alternative configurations, often without valuing one over another. The result is a description of relationships. In contrast, the present model assumes value judgments in that a particular result is the one to be achieved. The questions are centered on why it is not being achieved and there is an assumption of causal, rather than functional, relationships between the desired goal and the conditions that are variable.

The approach to the questions is systemic rather than alternative testing. That is, rather than looking at the effects of a variety of alternatives, the model looks for the alternative that will produce the desired goal. Because it views the independent variables as part of a system, conflict is the evidence that is used to determine what things to change. Once the conflict has been articulated as an issue, and the issue as a problem, a limited number of alternative treatments are examined and one is selected as most likely to resolve the problem. Thus, both the manipulation of conditions and the outcomes are valued rather than being treated as alternatives to be varied. The four categories of treatments described in this paper are acceptable alternatives, in congruence with program goals. The definition of the problem and the identification of crucial variables delineates possible treatments.

In terms of formulating research questions, then, the management model has the characteristic of formulating only a limited number of questions which are focused by the conflicts in the program. The consequent limitation is that this research model will never generate a description of the entire range of variables that must be considered, nor will it test the outcomes of a variety of relationships among the variables. The research will also have a lack of scope because it does not document nor study in detail the more quiet, (but perhaps very significant) and successful aspects of operation. But the limited focus of this model is also a strength. The conflict management model has an in-built sense of priorities. It focuses on key issues, avoids low points and trivialities, and gets quickly and directly to the heart of the matter. It focuses first on the most important issues and moves gradually outward to more and more detailed, more and more sophisticated inquiry.

This management model of research is severely limited in the controls it exercises over the conditions it manipulates. In the Ford program, subjects are not assigned randomly to groups; instead we have selected those people whom we think are most likely to make the cadres s cceed. There have been few control groups because we focused our attemtion on making the cadres successful and did not divert the resources necessary to create controls. There have not been different planned treatments; instead, there has been an effort to use only the best treatment. In terms of Kerlinger's distinctions,[48] this managerial method of research is much more ex post facto than experimental. But that is because the management of a program must be focused first on attaining its goals successfully and only secondarily on controlled experimentation with variables. Getting it to work comes first. From the management point of view, explaining why it works grows out of that.

In terms of answering research questions, the management model has the characteristic of a stable focus and depth. The limitation of this characteristic is its lack of balance. Because it is focused on conflict, it is likely to paint a bleak picture of what is being accomplished. To overcome this limitation, it must be balanced by an appropriate reporting of successes. But this characteristic is also a strength. Because it brings to bear a very broad knowledge base, it can use information and formulate answers that are more comprehensive than other research methods. Because of its in-built sense of priorities, it maintains its focus and does not dissipate its efforts by trying to go in every direction at once. It has strong payoff in moving the operation toward its goals and in identifying the conditions that are likely to create problems in reaching those goals.

And finally, let us end where we began. The conflict management research model is a valuable tool in getting at the existential nature of new and ex-

perimental programs. Most research efforts begin their reporting where this method ends -- with the establishment of a smoothly functioning program. This method gives us a valuable way to get at the existential conditions that precede the typical experimental literature. Of course, all administrators use some set of techniques for making decisions, but the explication of the structure and the content of the process is often obscure, and the techniques are seldom turned to function as research tool. Articulating the structure and content of managerial decision-making allows the administrator to communicate more precisely what is going on in the development of a smoothly functioning program. The administrative decision-making process is not primarily a formalized research methodology, but identifying the research processes that are implicit in the administrative task has great value. It formulates problems and identifies conditions which are an important foundation for later more formalized and controlled experimental research. And in doing so it makes replication of the program by other institutions easier because it articulates problems, and points to crucial conditions that are often slighted in the reportage of formalized experimental research. This managerial method is worthy of the title research because it formulates and answers significant questions about the relationship between program variables and program outcomes.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Ford Training and Placement Program is a cooperative effort of the University of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education funded by the Ford Foundation and housed in the Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, designed to train and place cadres, or groups, of teachers in urban schools. The conceptual model for the program is described in Jacob W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner-City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," The School Review, autumn, 1967. The operations of the program are described in Henrietta Schwartz' "A Social Systems Approach to Training Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program," Education at Chicago, autumn, 1971.

2. "Rough Draft - Raw Chronology of Ford Training and Placement Program," February, 4, 1969, mimeo, p. 8.

3. A cadre is the principle training mechanism of the program. Cadre members are chosen to represent the social system of the school - both in professional roles and social subgroups. The cadre usually has about twenty members and includes interns, experienced teacher interns, school-based members, the administrator, role specialists, a community representative, and two staff roles - the cadre liaison and the group process consultant.

4. Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research in Teaching" in N. L. Gage (ed.) Handbook of Research in Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, pp. 171-246.

5. This paper was prepared in conjunction with three others for presentation at the American Educational Research Association 1973 Convention. The session compared the four research approaches in terms of their effectiveness in formulating and answering significant research questions. The other papers are: Ron Kimmons, "The Historical Method of Inquiry in a Teacher Training Program: Theory and Metatheory"; Michael Waller and Donald Soltz, "The Classical Psychometric Method of Evaluation of FTPP"; and Kaffie Weaver, "A Case Study of the Group Life of the Martin L. King, Jr. High School Cadre, 1971-1972."

6. Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process, New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

7. James F. McCampbell, "A Transactional Style of Organization Process," October, 1972, mimeo.

8. Wayne Doyle, "Memo to Staff on Pyramiding Resources", Spring, 1970. ditto.

9. There was one pre-service intern in school social work from the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration.

10. R. Smith and S. Skurdy, "Observations of the Forrestville Cadre After A Year", July 24, 1970, mimeo, p. 5.

11. H. Schwartz, "Ford Training and Placement Program Progress Report - 1971-72", FTPP News Briefs, January, 1973.

12. e.g., Kathy Gaus-Woollen, "Evaluation of the Summer Training Program - 1971", June, 1972, mimeo.

13. Sid Osborne, "Some Perceptions of the Cadre Liaison Role at Martin Luther King High School", pp. 102-106 and Kaffie Weaver, "Concerns and Comments: Emotionality and Team Work, A Theoretical Perspective", pp. 96-101 in King Cadre Interim Report, February, 1972, mimeo. Juliet Walker, "History of the FTPP - Phase II," July, 1972, mimeo.

14. R. Smith, "Comparative Observations of Two Cadres," King Cadre Interim Report, February, 1972, mimeo, pp. 108-109.

15. H. Schwartz and J. McCampbell, "FTPP Progress Report - 1969-70", FTPP News Briefs, January, 1971, p. 9.

16. Wayne Doyle, "Report on the Formal Training Phase of the Summer Program", September 18, 1969, mimeo. Wayne Doyle, "Evaluation of the Summer Program 1970", November, 1970, mimeo. Kathie Gaus-Woollen, op. cit.

17. John Sawyer, "Model for Martin Luther King, Jr. High School All Experienced Teacher Cadre" minutes of the FTPP All Day Staff Meeting, Center for Continuing Education, March 19, 1971, mimeo, pp. 2 and 3.

18. The only placement problem unsolved concerned the role specialists (adult education, social psychological specialist, school social worker) whose functions had not been legitimated by the Chicago Public Schools at the school building level.

19. Ray Jerrems, "Goals of the FTPP", 1968, mimeo. Henrietta Schwartz, "Statement of Goals of the FTPP", November, 1969, mimeo.

20. Richard Smith and Stephanie Skurdy, op. cit.

21. John Sawyer, "Staff Reports of Monthly Activities, September, October, and November, 1971", mimeo.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. Richard Smith and Stephanie Skurdy, op. cit.

25. Wayne Doyle, "Transactional Evaluation" in Robert Rippey's (ed.) Studies in Transactional Evaluation, McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkeley, 1972 (in press).

26. The School principal, who had cooperated in the selection process, was promoted before the cadre began training and was replaced in the cadre by an acting principal.

27. Henrietta Schwartz, "The Development of a Selection Model", March, 1972, mimeo.

28. "Role Descriptions of FTPP Staff", March 24, 1971, mimeo.

29. The FTPP staff had many of the same conflicts. Most field staff were both employees of the program and graduate students in University programs at the same time.

30. Vera Dexter, "The Adult Educator's Progress Report and Plans for the Future", King Cadre Interim Report, February, 1962, mimeo, pp. 92-95.

31. Thomas Brady, "Assessment of the FTPP Adult Educator Interns Plight" March, 1972, mimeo, pp. 1-7.

32. John Sawyer, "September Report on Activities of the Forrestville Cadre," October, 1969, mimeo, p. 2.

33. In turn the program's response to these silly conflicts was sometimes unreasonable, giving vent to the staff's need to control the program's components.

34. See list of "Forrestville Cadre Concerns," November, 1969, mimeo.

35. Wayne Doyle and Henrietta Schwartz, "Methodology: A Crucial Issue for Research and Evaluation in Experimental Programs," October, 1970, mimeo.

36. "Cadre Self-Evaluation", outline prepared by the Forrestville Cadre, March, 1970, mimeo. Smith and Skurdy, "Observations of the Forrestville Cadre After A Year, op. cit.

37. Randall Bailey, "Forrestville Cadre Interview Report," July, 1970, mimeo, p. 1.

38. Bruce Thompsett and Wayne Doyle, "The Impact of Cadres on School Settings", September, 1971, mimeo, p. 1.

39. Curriculum Projects of the FTPP, 1969-1971, mimeo.

40. Wayne Doyle, "Transactional Evaluation", op. cit.

41. a) H. Schwartz, "Memo to the Forrestville Cadre regarding your memo of 7/23/70, mimeo.
b) From the FTPP Staff, "Memo to Cadres Concerning the Function and selection of Placement Year Liaisons", August 4, 1970.

42. Smith and Skurdy, "Observations of the Forrestville Cadre After A Year", July, 1970, mimeo, pp. 5-6 and 8-9.

43. "An Overview of Martin Luther King - Forrestville as the FTPP Demonstration and Induction School," February 2, 1971, mimeo, p. 2.

44. Charles Almo (cadre member and now principal of Martin Luther King, Jr. High School) and the first King cadre, "Proposal to the Ford Training and Placement Program for the Demonstration School," March 8, 1971, mimeo, p. 8.

45. "FTPP Staff Recommendations for a Demonstration School to the FTPP Executive Committee," March, 1971, ditto, p. 2.

46. Kathie Gaus-Woollen, "Evaluation of the 1971 Summer Training Program", July, 1972, mimeo. The report indicates the second King cadre's responses to the program were very positive. However, the Ford Program had been revised according to what we had learned in our transactions with the first King and other cadres.

47. John Sawyer III, "A Consultant's Perspective on the Martin Luther King cadre of the FTPP," July, 1972, mimeo, p. 5. The report reviews observations and data from questionnaires during the period June, 1971 to June, 1972.

48. Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.